

THE
CHARLESTON GOSPEL MESSENGER,
AND
Protestant Episcopal Register.

Vol. XVII.

JULY, 1840.

No. 195.

FOR THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.

A SERMON.

MATT. XXII. 40.

"On these two commandments, hang all the law and the prophets."

Unlike systems of false religion, which concern themselves little, or not at all with the life and character, and deal wholly, or principally, in speculations and in ceremonies; the true religion indissolubly links together principle and action, faith and practice, doctrine and duty, truth with precept and example. What God hath thus joined together, his Church, as his agent for instruction, takes special care not to separate. In our system of teaching during a part of the year, the great *doctrines* of religion, its truths, as set forth in the life of our Lord Jesus Christ, are *inculcated*, that is, on the Sundays beginning with Advent, and ending with Trinity Sunday. In the remaining portion of the year, (which is nearly of the same duration) the practical obligations of a Christian are set forth, and now we are especially taught what we are to *do*, as before we were, what we are to believe. That portion of the year, in which more particularly we are reminded by the Church of our *duties*, commences with the first of the Sundays after Trinity, and ends with the last of these Sundays. Not only in the appointed Scriptures, but in the sermons, the great truths of our religion (as the incarnation of the Son of God—his temptation—death and resurrection, and ascension, and the descent of the Holy Ghost) *have been* successively brought to your notice, and we are now in due order, to invite you to consider its precepts. The first and great commandment, we are told, is to love the Lord our God. The consideration of *that* duty, as to *what* it implies, and more particularly, as to its inseparable connexion with an acceptable love of man, seems therefore an appropriate subject for our sermon on this day. "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

It is not an uncommon error to regard morality as the *whole of religion*. It may be a part of religion; but it often has no connexion whatever with it. In this latter case, although approved and admired by our fellow men; although gratifying its possessor, and benefiting society at large, it will have no better tendency to procure the favor of the Almighty, than the most *indifferent action*, which a man can perform. These are the points to be inferred from the text, which it is intended at this time,

practically to consider. Morality is the rule of duty towards our *fellow men*. It embraces many and important obligations—those of patriotism, of social life, and of the family relation. But there is a whole class of duties, those to *God*, our creator, our redeemer, our sanctifier, the obligations of the first table, which comprises the love and worship of God, the abstaining from idolatry, the honoring of the Divine name, and the keeping the Sabbath-day holy, which are beyond the scope of *morality*. Now *this* is to be done, but the other is not to be left undone. Indeed, the duty to *God* is not only an essential part, but it is the *principal* part of obedience. It is the first and great commandment. We are required to love our neighbor as ourselves, but the love of God is placed upon a higher scale. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." To his service all our faculties are to be supremely devoted. The strength of the body, the sensibility of the heart, the wisdom of the intellect, and the moral powers of the immortal principle, the soul, are to be consecrated to the service of our God, for he who gave us our faculties may justly claim their choicest efforts. You perceive then how small a part of religion, morality is. When it proceeds from the right motive, it is undoubtedly a part of religion, but let it not be considered as the whole of it, let it not usurp the place of higher duties; let not the mere moralist, however exalted his attainments, suppose that he is a religious man. This is a common delusion, and it is a very strange one. The person who, with great professions of reverence for God, and regard to his positive institutions, neglects his *moral* duties, is justly considered a hypocrite. It is held universally, that the love of God cultivated independently of the love of man, is a mere pretence. But it is equally true, that the latter, without the former, is, in a religious point of view, of no value—for what can be more explicit than the text, "On these *two* commandments," not on *one*, "hang all the law and the prophets." The prevalence of a different opinion, can be traced only to a blindness of understanding, the melancholy effect of the corruption of our nature.

But there is another view of the subject. It is taking the most favorable view of morality, to consider it a branch of *religion*. It seldom has a claim to this distinction. When its foundation is a sense of the Divine authority, in that case only, can it be considered as forming a part of the religious character. But, let me ask, has the current morality so good a foundation? Let us consider it, for a moment, in its several branches. The love of country is a Christian duty, commended to us by fair inference from precepts in the bible; by the example of David, and other good men; and especially by the example of our blessed Lord, who, we are told, wept over his country, and thus expressed his emotions: "Oh Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thee as a hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, but ye would not." And was not patriotism concerned in his injunction to preach among all nations, *beginning at Jerusalem*? (Luke xxiv. 47.) But *what* is the *usual* foundation of *this* virtue in the *human* bosom? Is it the authority of *God*? or is it the power of association by which the scenes of our childhood, and the home of our parents are endeared to us? Is it not a sense of the peculiar advantages in our estimation to be enjoyed in our

own country ; or the principle of gratitude for favors she has bestowed on us ; or the love of that reputation which is conferred on her friends ; or an habitual feeling cultivated assiduously from our tenderest infancy. Now whatever advantages may result from *this* love of country, and however wise it may be to encourage it, by every possible motive, yet it ought not to be mistaken for a Christian virtue, unless it has a Christian foundation. The possessor of it has his reward, *in this world*, without any inquiry into his *motives* ; but when it becomes an object of Divine scrutiny, it must be probed to the bottom, and the *Divine favor* can be expected for it, only on the supposition that it has been cultivated with a view to this object ; that the man has been influenced not so much by worldly motives, as by the great religious motive, the fear of God, the desire of conforming to his holy will.

Again, let us suppose that the rule of justice has been rigidly regarded, even to the extent of the Christian standard, "to do unto all men as you would they should do unto you," it will be perceived that the *grounds* of this obedience may be very different in different persons. Selfish considerations regulate the obedience of many. Their reputation ; their advancement in the world ; their security from the inroads of others ; may be the sole motives of their virtue. Fair to the eye and fragrant to the moral sense, it may be a mere whited sepulchre ; without, all loveliness ; but within, full of all uncleanness. If men could see *within*, they would judge correctly, and they hold in high estimation such a character, only because they have an *imperfect* view of it, because they are not permitted to see any more than the outside of it. But God seeth the *heart*, and of what value in his sight will the prevalent integrity of mankind prove ; the integrity which is created and preserved by selfishness, which would vanish into empty air if this worthless motive were removed.

But there is another class who adhere to the maxims of justice from a sense of *honor*. They have been taught, and have long cherished the instruction, to abhor every thing that is mean and dishonorable, and to estimate highly the character which is pure, lovely, and of good report. In *them*, self-respect is the guardian of good conduct. Now, in this wicked world, this scene of temptation, to man born in sin, who would object to a multiplication of motives on the side of virtue ? Who will deny to the man of honor his deserved respect and esteem ? This is the reward which he has fairly won. If he aimed at this, over and above his self-approbation, it is the most he aimed at. God was not *at all* in his thoughts, how then can it be expected that he should be in the regard of the Divine mind. Whatever praise you may think him entitled to, however useful you may conceive him to have been in the world, there is in his character no single ingredient of the religious man. The *external* conduct is the same, but how essentially different is he from those (ah, how few) who do justice, who observe the golden rule of the Saviour, because it is *his* rule : *not* in the hope of receiving a return ; *not* in obedience to the public sentiment, or a sense of personal dignity merely, but from respect for the authority of God. Such a man was the Baptist : "John was a *just* man and an holy."

The Lord requires us also to love mercy ; to be kind to our fellow men ; freely communicating according to our ability, and their necessi-

ties, our services, our substance, and our sympathy. But we are told there are persons who do good, hoping to receive something again; and we know from daily observation, that much of the prevalent benevolence is concealed self-love. By the overruling of our wise moral governor, that selfish principle which, unrestrained, would spread ruin around it, has been made to minister to the public good. Uncharitableness is disgraceful, and it is happy for the world that it is so. But they who want the true *principle* of charity, whatever good they may effect in their endeavor to shake off their merited reproach, and however much they may deceive mankind by their outward conduct, can never be otherwise than hateful to God. He sees both the cause and the effect, and can never mistake the counterfeit for the sterling virtue. Again, to all men he has given a portion of humility, and like other instincts, it may be cultivated, and its power enlarged. It is undoubtedly a minister of much good, but whatever may be its effects, in its natural or improved state, it ought not to be confounded with the Christian virtue of charity. The man of sensibility has his reward. The overflowings of the soul enrich its own territory. "It is more blessed to give than to receive." But let it not be supposed, that he is entitled to the high reward, which is held forth to those who do good *for conscience sake*. St. Paul says, it is possible for a man to give all his goods to feed the poor, and yet be profited nothing, i. e. of no estimation in the sight of God. He denies that such persons have real charity, or the principle of love to our neighbor originating in a sense of the Divine authority.

Once more. A careful parent, a kind brother or sister, an ever watchful husband or wife, a dutiful child, a disinterested friend—these are no common characters, and it is impossible not to acknowledge their worth, or not to admire and love them. But it would be an *error* to suppose, that they are therefore the favorites of God, because they are the favorites of men, that their attention to the relative duties of earth will *atone* for their neglect of duty to their father in heaven; or that he who governs all events will regard with favor their good conduct, without any reference to the *motive* by which it has been actuated. For wise and beneficent purposes, God has made the ties of kindred indescribably strong. We find they are strong, even in the brute creation. Shall an instinct be elevated to the rank of a virtue? And does it essentially alter the case if the instinct has been improved by the arts of cultivation? Is there not also in relative love some lurking selfishness? Is there not an implied compact to promote each other's prosperity?

If you deduct from the character of a good relation all that is *constitutional*, and every particle of selfishness, what will be left as justly attributable to the influence of the Divine law? How many children honor their parents, and how many parents provide for their household, *without any reference* to the Divine law! Let them have their just reward from each other, and mankind, but what claim can they possibly have to any reward from God? And yet when such an excellent parent or child is removed by death, how often do survivors repose on the recollection of their *relative* fidelity; and how often does this declaration not merely minister consolation, but encourage them to believe, that their own character has some favorable features in the sight of God,

merely because it has such features in the sight of men, and in their own sight.

The points which have been treated are so obvious, that they might seem scarcely to need any illustration. But, my brethren, I appeal to your own observation, and your own consciousness, whether I have been contending with a shadow. What is more common than to say he is a good man in whom there is no reason to believe that there exists a single sentiment of *piety*, who is an utter stranger to the love of God; who habitually neglects the first and great commandment, and whose morality however unexceptionable so far as man can see, has no better foundation than constitutional sympathy, or the sense of honor, or it may be the worthless basis of a selfishness, which disguises itself under the name of a regard for reputation, or some other name. I do not speak of goodness in that qualified sense, in which it may be predicated of irreligious men, but as it is often applied to signify, that the person has at least some title to the favor of God—that he possesses some of the characteristics of true religion. Often is it applied, when death has put a seal on the character, and there is more than ever occasion to speak cautiously. Now that which is asserted in this discourse is, that there is no religion—no ground for favor from God in that character in which the love of our neighbour or morality exists, and the love of God does not exist; and that the love of our neighbour may proceed from other motives than those of a religious nature—from motives of selfishness which religion not only disdains but abhors—from motives of honorable sentiment which have no reference whatever beyond this world—or lastly, from motives, or rather, instincts of the constitution implanted by the Creator, but which belong to our physical and not to our moral nature. These positions we have endeavored to illustrate by a reference to the great branches of morality, the love of our country, justice, benevolence, and family attachment.

But, my brethren, permit me to bring the subject nearer to your own bosoms. It may be you are rich in the esteem of your fellow-men, held up as a model to the rising generation, happy in the recollection of substantial services rendered to mankind—many of them, it may be, veiled by your own praise-worthy diffidence. Probably your integrity is not only above impeachment, but above the least suspicion, and her breath would vanish from it, as from the polished mirror of steel. You add to your justice brotherly kindness, and your mind is ever awake, your heart ever open, and your substance generously devoted in the cause of benevolence, whether she claim you for some public object, or for the lonely sufferer who cannot dig, and to beg is ashamed. In the discharge of every relative duty, you may be most exemplary, and while your presence is the cheerful sun of the domestic circle, your absence is always felt, and your death would produce a shock inconceivably terrible. But is this the whole of your character? *Do you love the lord your God? Do you love your neighbour, in obedience to the law of God?* If not, there is one thing you yet lack—one thing is still wanting—it is the one thing needful to your sure peace, and everlasting felicity. It is the pearl of great price. Whatever honors may be heaped upon you—however elevated you may be in the respect and confidence of the community—however dear to your own family, and

happy in the recollection of your public conduct and private virtues; all these are not religion. It will contribute to your present enjoyment, but it can have no influence on your future destiny, if it be unsanctified by the fear of God, unless it originated in a principle of obedience to the Divine authority. Here then is a criterion of your spiritual condition. Are the love and fear of God the *motives* of your conduct? Then you are a religious man. Then the hopes of religion belong to you. A Christian, says Archbishop Whately, is one whose motives are *Christian* faith and *Christian* hope; and who is moreover able to give a reason of the hope that is in him. Christianity is a religion of *motives*. Many persons practice temperance, and other virtues, which Christianity inculcates, but who never think of doing so, *because* they are *so inculcated*. To call such persons Christians would be as absurd as to ascribe a knowledge of mechanics to savages, because they *employ the lever*."

If then, my brethren, your conduct however amiable, and valuable, has its origin in any other than a Christian motive, whether it be sympathy, or self-love, or the sentiment of honor, it is not religion. It has no claim to its peace, its joy, and its everlasting reward. This is sufficiently plain to the understanding. May God enable you to lay it to your hearts. May you escape the wiles of Satan and the delusions of the world, and so live here that you may live forever with your Father and Redeemer. AMEN.

FOR THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.

THE DOCTRINE OF EPISCOPACY.

"This theme (viz., the conformity of the external organization of the Church to the pattern given us by Christ and the Apostles) should be duly presented to the public view, in connexion with, *and subserviency to*, the great doctrines and duties of religion."

It is not material to name the discourse from which are quoted the above words. The sentiment is a common one. In conversation, as well as in writings, it often meets us. Is it a correct sentiment? It is, if it be intended to make the same assertions, *and no other*, which we have in the first paragraph of "the preface" to our "Book of Common Prayer," viz., that "in his (Christ's) worship, different forms and usages may, without offence, be allowed, provided the substance of the faith be kept entire; and therefore, may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, &c." That *so much* of the "external organization of the Church" is *subservient* to the great doctrines and duties of religion, is admitted of course. But "external organization" is a comprehensive description. It includes the worship, the canonical regulations, and the ministry of the Church. In matters not decided by scripture, the Church has authority to make such regulations, such canons and rubrics, as in her wisdom may seem good for edifying. But the ministry is of Divine institution. No Church can determine (as some Christians at least seem to have done) that there shall be no ministry—and that there shall be only one order, or more than three in it. The ministry, though it be an element in the external organization of the Church, belongs to doctrine, and not to discipline exclusively. "Episcopacy," that is, a min-

istry of three orders, in which the Bishop is of the first order, is a doctrine of the gospel to be taught "in connexion with the great doctrines of religion." Obedience to such a ministry is, a duty to be taught "in connexion with the great duties of religion." To present that doctrine and that duty "in subserviency" to other doctrines and duties—to do any thing which would imply that Episcopacy is not a great doctrine, and conformity to it a lesser duty, will not, we conceive, on reflection, be maintained. But opinions liable to be misunderstood, are often uttered and printed. And we fear there are some, (certainly among persons not of our communion) who regard the principle that the Church is a divinely constituted Society, having its proper officers of different grades, with which it is a duty to be united, as a secondary matter, respecting which Christians may differ, who would be blameable if they differed as to other doctrines and duties—that it is a non-fundamental, and that, for charity sake, it is best not only not to insist upon it, but particularly to disregard it. Now it seems to us, and we deem it right so to declare, that to surrender the *doctrine* of Episcopacy, to regard it as no doctrine, but only alterable discipline, is not to keep "the substance of the faith entire;" and also, that he who pays equal deference to a ministry of human, and of Divine appointment; who does not obey the "Bishops, Priests and Deacons," (they who have the rule over him committed to them by the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls himself) violates not a small, but a great duty of the Christian religion.

AN OBSERVER OF THE CHURCH.

FOR THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE CAUSE AND THE MEANS OF JUSTIFICATION.

Messrs. Editors.—In illustration of the point at the head of this article, or rather in corroboration of the remarks in your last number respecting it,* let me refer the reader to the report of a recent visit by the present Bishop of Calcutta. In that document we read: "I began, therefore, with the examination for baptism. The candidates were arranged in rows. 'Are you sinners?' 'Yes, we are all sinners,' was resounded from one end of the chapel to the other. 'How are you to obtain forgiveness?' 'By the sacrifice of Christ,' re-echoed the crowd.—'Who is Christ?' 'The only Son of God.'—'What do you mean by his sacrifice?' 'We were sinners, and deserved God's wrath; and Christ bore that wrath in the stead of us,' shouted some. 'He suffered in our place,' cried other voices.—I pause, to call the Society's attention to this point; the Kurta-Bhojas uniformly seize on the doctrine of atonement; they say, 'this is what we have been seeking for.' It seems that their notion of obtaining a sight of God is met by the doctrine of a God Incarnate suffering for man. Thus our Missionaries, like St. Paul, know nothing among their converts but *Jesus Christ and Him crucified*; which, though still a *stumbling-block* to some, and folly to others, is *Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God*, to them that are called,

* See the article entitled "An Oxford Author," &c.

of all nations, and kindreds, and tongues, and people. But I proceed. 'How is your heart to be changed, and made holy?' 'By the Holy Ghost.' 'Why do you desire baptism?' 'To obtain the pardon of our sins.'"

Now here the Bishop notices first, the cause of man's justification, viz. "the sacrifice of Christ." He then adverts to the means of his justification, or rather to *one* of those means, viz. 'baptism.' He does not mention faith, but no one can doubt from his writings generally, that he held faith to be a means of justification. He sees no heresy in the regarding the sacrament of baptism as "a means whereby we receive 'the same,'" viz. grace as a means "to obtain the pardon of our sins."

Let me add, the whole of the Bishop's report is worthy of attentive reading, not only for its *facts* cheering to the friend of Missions, but for its sound views of Christian truths and usages; in other words, for its faithful developement of our Church principles and customs.

P. M.

FOR THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.

ON THE IMPUTATION OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS.

This doctrine is understood by theologians in two very different senses. One class hold it, as a figurative illustration of the great truth, that there is no salvation but through the merits of Christ—that but for his perfect righteousness which fitted him to make atonement for man; and but for that atonement by him; in other words, but for his passive and active merits, there could have been no salvation for condemned man. When *they* speak therefore of Christ's righteousness being imputed to true believers, they mean nothing more than that they are saved not by their own merits, but only for the merits (one of which merits was his perfect righteousness) of our Lord Jesus Christ. But there is another class of theological writers, who understand this phrase of Christ's *imputed* righteousness, (and by the by, it is a humanly coined phrase, for the scripture speaks of "faith being imputed for righteousness," it says nothing of our Lord's righteousness *being imputed*) as denying the necessity, for making the salvation by Christ effectual, of righteousness—of "amendment of life" on the part of the disciple. They hold the doctrine of unconditional election, and as a part and parcel of it, that man is redeemed by the sacrifice of Christ, and saved by the righteousness of Christ, which righteousness renders the man's own righteousness, though proper, though expedient, yet not *indispensable*. Now we admit, that *perfect* obedience is not indispensable, (for were it, who could be saved)—that a long continued course of evangelical obedience is not indispensable, (for some may be removed from this life soon after their conversion) but in the light of this scriptural declaration, "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord," we must maintain, that obedience in the spirit, though not always in the letter, (for by reason of sudden death, or by the want of access to a ministry, there may be no opportunity) to the commandments, and ordinances of the Lord, is necessary unto salvation. We mean to say, that salvation, though it could not be but for the merits of Christ, has annexed to it conditions to be complied with by his disciple—that though he could not have been saved

without Christ's righteousness, neither can he be saved by it, unless there be on his part at least the element of holiness—the disposition (which, if circumstances permit, will be acted out) of evangelical obedience—the disposition to seek union with God's people or Church, by baptism—to keep up that communion by the Lord's Supper—and to live godly, righteously and soberly—to walk humbly with God—to do justice to all living creatures, and to shew them mercy. It is to the doctrine of imputation, not in the general, the figurative sense, but in the sense which implies the Calvinistic tenet of the sovereign or unconditional predestination of men—which does away the *necessity* of obedience to the laws and institutions of the gospel, which, to say the least, favors the solefidian or antinomian theory, that some of the wisest, most learned, and most holy of our standard authors, object. Some of these, even object to the phrase that Christ's righteousness is imputed, because it is liable to be misunderstood; because it is generally used in an objectionable sense; and because they prefer to inculcate the sense, in which the phrase is correct, in scriptural language, as for example, "neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name whereby we must be saved," but "the name of Jesus Christ." It would certainly cut off much controversy, if many technical theological words and phrases were dismissed from use, and scripture, or unambiguous language was substituted.

P. M.

PERVERSION OF SCRIPTURE TEXTS.

FOR THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.

Messrs. Editors.—It has been said that the text 1 Cor. xv. 32, is incorrectly pointed, that it should be thus: "If I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what profiteth it me? If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." It may be remarked, that in the Greek original, and in a French version now before me, the pointing is the same as in our English version, and the objection to that pointing does not appear to be well founded. It is said, the sense is destroyed by it, since the Apostle's design was to represent non-resurrection as a reason for taking no thought for the future, for eating and drinking, as if this life was the whole of our existence—that it was not his design to represent non-resurrection as taking away the motive for his contending with beasts at Ephesus. Now it seems to us he had *both* these designs—that he intended to teach, that "if the dead rise not," there is no good reason for submitting to martyrdom, (or in other words, for fighting with beasts at Ephesus)—nor for the self-denial, in eating and drinking, which is the habit of the Christian. The expression, "if the dead rise not," was intended to refer as well to the remark, "what advantageth it me if I have fought with beasts at Ephesus," as to the other remark, "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." It is not uncommon in the best writers, to leave a word or a sentence to be supplied by the reader, where the sense so requires. They who would alter the pointing of the received version, do not seem to be aware, that if they thereby add force to the last clause of the text, they take it away from the preceding clause, for the question, "What advantageth it me to have fought with beasts," is a comparatively unimportant one, unless you add to it,

"if the dead rise not." It seems to us, that in the public reading of it, the manner should indicate that the doctrine of the resurrection is referred to, as a motive not only for the Christian's courage, but for his self-government, as if the whole passage was thus: "If I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die;" that is, eternally, if as "some among you say," it be indeed the case that the dead rise not. There is a disposition in some quarters to find fault with the English Bible "as it is," but we trust good Churchmen will not encourage it, by objecting even to a point, and especially when, as in the present instance, a change is not necessary, or would be no improvement.

P. M.

NOTICE OF NEW PUBLICATION.

Justification by Faith: A Charge delivered before the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ohio, and at the twenty-second Annual Convention of the Diocese, in St. Paul's Church, Steubenville, Sept. 13, 1839. With an Appendix. By the Right Rev. Charles P. McIlvaine, D.D., Bishop of the Pro. Epis. Church in the Diocese of Ohio.—A charge of a Bishop to the Clergy in his Diocese, is a sort of family concern, with which a stranger should hesitate to meddle. But the publication before us has been circulated throughout our whole country, and we doubt not, sent to other lands—has been reprinted with high commendations in periodicals out of Ohio—is in a degree controversial, for in the "advertisement," a contrast is invited with other publications on the same topic—in "the preface," we are told "the peculiarities of the Oxford divinity were often in view"—it makes objections to the doctrine of "progressive justification," which is held by some of our divines—and finally, the book (for it is not a pamphlet) has on the cover a title like that of a *treatise*. There is therefore a propriety, perhaps an obligation, to enter on such inquiries as these: Does this treatise, (which may influence the doctrinal views of some, and in particular of our young members) make clear, or clearer than before its main subject, which is certainly one "hard to be understood?" Does it contain positions of doubtful import, which, according to one construction, are scriptural; and according to another, not so?

As to the first question, we remark: that it seems to us the doctrine that "there is none other name given under heaven whereby we can be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ," (Acts iv. 12.) or in the words of our XIth Article, "we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ"—needs no vindication, so far as the members of our Church are concerned. As to *this* doctrine, "as declared in the Scriptures and embodied in the standard writings of the Church," there is "substantial agreement" among our clergy and laity. And yet, a great part of this treatise is occupied with the proof of this doctrine from holy scripture, our standard formularies, and approved authors. But the point about which there are diverse views in our Church, is not as to the *cause*, but as to the *means* of justification—not as to man's entire dependance on Christ for pardon and glory, but as to

how he is to obtain these precious blessings from his Redeemer. Salvation is conditional, or unconditional. There is only one, or there are more than one condition. The theory that salvation is without conditions, is held by the Universalists, and by the Calvinists—the former maintaining that all, without exception—the latter, that the elect only, will be saved; but both asserting that the saved, whether all, or a few only, are saved *unconditionally*. Which of the theories, the conditional or the unconditional, does the work before us adopt? There are passages which favor one, and others the other, of these contradictory systems. For example, we read: “Even faith justifies not, under its character as a *work* of obedience, one of the fruits of the Spirit, but simply, “under that relative office of receiving and applying Christ,” the hand that takes of the righteousness of Christ and appropriates it unto us, while laying our sins on the head of that wonderful sacrifice; a hand without price, without desert, a sinful, as well as empty hand, meriting to be smitten dead for its own defects, and the sinfulness of him whose hand it is, while, as God’s appointed means, it *puts on Christ* and clothes the sinner in His righteousness.” * * “Faith is effectual for justification, simply as an act of embracing Christ, in all his offices, and benefits, and requirements, whereby the sinner lays hold of his promises, and puts on the garment of his justifying righteousness.” We do not say that these passages assert there is no condition necessary, but that they will be so understood by many, that they seem to favor that antinomian notion, the doctrine technically denominated “arbitrary, or sovereign or unconditional predestination.”

Again—there is one only, or more than one, condition required, to make available to the final salvation of the individual—the merits of his Redeemer. We read, p. 77: “Whenever a sinner believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, though his sins be as scarlet, and as many as the sands—his sins (are) remembered no more:” p. 86, “the first act of faith justifies freely.” Pp. 94 and 95: “This doctrine of the instant and perfect justification of the sinner, the moment the hand of his faith but touches the robe of our blessed Redeemer’s righteousness—seems to me connected with the very essence of the gospel.” Here is named only one condition, viz., faith, and it is *not* the faith which is “the root of all Christian virtues,” “the complex of Christianity”—but “a single act of the soul,” (p. 101) “a simple act,” (p. 80.) The faith which includes “repentance, love and obedience,” is (p. 153) called a refinement. “That faith justifies us, as being the originating principle of love and good works,” is called (p. 153) a “corruption of the doctrine.” We repeat then, here is named only one condition—not a word of that repentance of which holy scripture saith, “Except ye repent, ye shall all *perish*”—not a word of that holiness respecting which we are divinely taught, “Without holiness (that is, in its element at least) no man shall see the Lord”—not a word of baptism, and yet an inspired teacher has said, “the like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us.” St. Paul names among the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, faith—but he also names “repentance from dead works,” and the doctrine of baptism.” (Heb. vi. 1.)

Although this treatise is so silent *here* as to the necessity of obedience, —though it disclaims that necessity, in the passages above quoted; yet

in page 114, we read "holy obedience, without which we can no more see the Lord, than we could see him without a living, holy faith:" and in p. 125, "without obedience, there can be neither the living faith that justifies, neither true holiness that makes us meet for the presence of God." In same page, we are taught, that faith is "the only way of justification." Perhaps it may be asked, does not our XIth Article represent faith as the only condition? It does, but we understand the faith there referred to, not in the restricted sense attached to it by this treatise, but a faith which is not mere belief, such as the devil's have; which is not mere trust, which may be authorized or unauthorized—but a faith which worketh by love—which implies renouncing of self, and a dependance on Christ, and is inseparable from contrition; and resolution, in humble dependance on divine grace, to live godly, righteously and soberly—to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with God—to walk in his commandments and ordinances to the life's end. It is to this comprehensive faith—this seminal principle, which he who sees the heart, knows will develope itself in all goodness and righteousness and truth—that so much efficacy is attributed in our article. In like manner, the belief required of the jailor (Acts xvi. 31) could not have been the mere assent of the understanding, (for *that* the devils have) neither was a "single act of the soul" deemed sufficient in his case, for he had given good evidence of another act of the soul, viz., deep sorrow for sin, and the belief required of him implied obedience, (that is, it was a practical, not a speculative belief) to "the word of the Lord," which the Apostles at that time "spoke unto him," and in particular his union with the Church, for we read, "he was baptized straightway." The Rev. Dr. Hammond thus paraphrases this text: He said, "Sirs, I see and acknowledge, the doctrine taught by you, is the truth of the eternal omnipotent God, *thus testified* by him, by miracles, which therefore all are bound to receive that will be saved. Tell me, *what I must do*, to be *capable* of that salvation; and they told him, that the receiving and embracing the *doctrine of Christ*, and regulating his life according to it, was *that* which was required of him, and his family." The Rev. Dr. Whitby's comment is this; "I, by this miracle, am induced to believe, you are men sent to shew us the way of salvation,—what therefore must I do to be saved. And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thine house, *for that faith* will bring thee into the way of salvation." His idea appears to be: *belief* is the *first* step—if genuine, it will be followed by a true repentance; and the next step will be, baptism, or union with the Church, which is the state of salvation—the old path, where is the good way to the end of our faith, even the salvation of our souls. "Believe (says Poole) with *that* faith, which bends the will to obedience of life, for often names of a *genus* are placed for a certain excellent *species*."

As to our second question: Does this treatise contain expressions or sentences of doubtful import? we reply by the following quotations: "*Justification*, in its most comprehensive sense, imports the making of a man *just* or *righteous*." Now, if by "making," is to be understood, regarding or considering, and so treating or dealing with a man as if he was just, we have not a word to say. But if it means, as some will understand it, the making him indefectible, we of course demur. "We no

sooner believe in Jesus Christ, than we are accounted righteous in him, and so are perfectly justified, and have entire peace with God." Now if this belief be of that kind which will bring forth evangelical obedience, and cause its subject, as of cause, to enter and continue in the communion of the Church, who will not concur; but if it is meant to teach, (and the many will probably so understand it) that the simple act of belief or trust in Christ, instantaneously and perfectly justifies and gives entire peace, (and we must remark, such a simple trust may exist where sorrow for sin, resolution of amendment, and even intention to become a disciple of Christ by the prescribed use of the sacrament of baptism are wanting) in that view of the quotation, who will accept it as sound doctrine? The Christian is said to work out his salvation with "fear and trembling." But here we are told of an "entire peace"—a perfect justification—which may be understood (erroneously of course) to favor what is technically called "the doctrine of a present salvation," that is, not a lively hope of final salvation, but a regarding it as certain, regarding the individual as in a condition of acceptance with God, from which he can by no possibility fall. A state of salvation from which we may fall, and to continue in which the price is perpetual vigilance and effort, is one thing—but the "present salvation" which some say they have attained, from which there is no drawing back unto "perdition," which makes sure the final salvation, is another matter. We read p. 100, of the "joyful assurances of the gospel." Its assurances are well founded hopes. But the context here, and the current of thought (96, 97) seem to speak of an assurance which is not hope, not "conjecture," but certainty. Was it intended (p. 79) to deny the justification at the tribunal of the last day? If not, then there is a "second justification." Is the perfectness of our justification (p. 80) intended to declare its indefectibility? Do all Christians *know*, (p. 98) as the inspired Paul did, that he would be saved? Does not Rom. viii. 24, imply the contrary?

We submit, with due respect, whether in this treatise, the doctrines of redemption and salvation are kept sufficiently distinct; whether the cause and the means of justification are so—whether the difference with Rome was as to human merit and faith, and not rather as to human merit and Christ's merit—whether there be not a plain distinction between the doctrine of imputation as held by many, with Bishop Andrews, (p. 139) and that doctrine as taught by the Calvinistic system, and the Universal system, (which was called by one of its founders in this country, "Calvinism improved"*)—whether the decision of the self tribunal, and that of God's tribunal at the final judgment, are not confounded, and also the state of acceptance on the earth with *that*, on which man enters after death.

The fear, that the doctrine of man's *entire* dependance for salvation on the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, may be disparaged, is a prominent feature of the treatise before us. We honor the motive. But we do not admit, that it is any disparagement of that most true, most important doctrine, to assert the necessity (as the Scriptures certainly do) of conditions. Shall the condemned malefactor, who would have been certainly executed but for the interposition of benevolence, and the

* The title of a work by Rev. Mr. Huntington.

mercy of the pardoning power, say that he was saved by his own merits, because he was saved, on conditions? Surely it does not diminish the amount of our obligation to our Divine Saviour, that he expects of us to feel grateful to him, and to manifest our gratitude by renouncing our old ways of sin, and endeavoring to do better for the time to come. Shall the drowning man think himself his own saviour, because he laid hold on the disinterested hero, who, at the hazard of his own life, plunged into the ocean and effected the rescue? And yet it was necessary that he should be willing to be saved, and improve the opportunity by his own exertions?

A late very sensible writer has the following apposite remarks on the mode of instruction employed in scripture: "In teaching moral duties, there are good reasons for introducing, as we find is occasionally done, some maxims which, taken separately, and interpreted with literal strictness, are at variance with each other. Instructions thus conveyed are evidently more striking and more likely to arouse the attention; and also, from the very circumstance that they call for careful reflection, more likely to make a lasting impression. We read in St. Paul, that Abraham was justified by faith, and in St. James, that he was justified by works. One discourse of our Lord's in which he makes mention of the day of judgment, and describes the blessing and the curse respectively pronounced on those who have performed or neglected such charitable offices as feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and ministering to the sick, might seem to favor the conclusion that our final doom is to depend exclusively on our care or neglect of our distressed brethren, without any regard to our faith, or to the purity or integrity of our lives; in his final charge to his disciples again, it might seem that every thing is made to depend on right belief alone; "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

What then is plainly the duty of the Bible reader? To rest his faith not on a word or a sentence, but comparing scripture with scripture, on the general tenor of that holy book, written not in the form of "exact science," but often in figurative language, which is most impressive, and cannot lead astray those who study, and not merely read "all scripture."

SELECTIONS.

JEPHTHAH'S RASH VOW.

Translated from the Italian.

JEPHTHAH being chosen captain of the children of Israel against the Amorites, prepared to attack them; but before commencing the battle, he vowed a vow unto the Lord, and said, If thou shalt without fail deliver the children of Ammon into my hand, then it shall be that whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt offering. (Judges xi. 30 & 31.) He obtained the victory, and on his return, as he approached his house, his only daughter came out to meet him with timbrels and dances, and

she was his only child; besides her he had neither son nor daughter, (v. 34.) At this sight the father was overcome by the most poignant grief, and tearing his garments, he confessed his vow to his daughter, who immediately resigned herself to his decree, but requested only a respite of two months, that she might go up and down in the mountain, to bewail her virginity. At the end of this period she returned to her father, who did with her according to his vow which he had vowed. From this circumstance arose the custom that the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah, four days in a year.

Such is, in substance, a passage which has perplexed and divided interpreters in every age. Some have supposed that the father sacrificed his daughter, and offered her up as a burnt offering, while others with more probability, have concluded that he only secluded her from the pleasures and enjoyment of life, by devoting her to the service of religion. The Jews, generally, are of opinion that Jephthah sacrificed his daughter; and Josephus, imbued with the ancient traditions of his nation, and Calmet, as well as many other modern critics, have entertained this revolting idea. St. Paul, on the contrary, (Heb. xi. v. 32. and 33.) classes Jephthah among those who had "wrought righteousness and obtained promises;" and most modern divines have concluded that the rash vow was not terminated by the cruel sacrifice.

The translator of the Vulgate was, undoubtedly, influenced by the traditions prevalent among the Jews on this subject, and by the opinions of some of the early fathers, who supposed that Jephthah sacrificed his daughter. The text of the Vulgate reads, "*Quicumque primus fuerit egressus de foribus domus meae mihi qui occurrerit revetenti cum pace a filiis Ammon, eum holocaustum offeram Domino.*" There can be no doubt that *quicumque* can only be applied to a human being, and the phrase *eum holocaustum offeram* likewise conveys the idea of making a cruel sacrifice, similar to that which was made with animals in the Jewish service. The last verse of the chapter, as rendered by the Vulgate, strengthens this opinion, by stating that the daughters of Israel lamented the daughter of Jephthah four days every year. The Hebrew text, however says, "It shall be the Lord's, and I will make it ascend (as) an ascension." This last clause signifies, I will offer it as a burnt offering. In this double expression of the vow, agree the Septuagint, the Syriac and Arabic versions. The Chaldee Paraphrase of Jonathan says, "And it shall be before the Lord, and I will make it ascend as a burnt offering." But it is to be remarked that the particle *vau*, in Hebrew, which is rendered *and* in English, has a disjunctive as well as conjunctive force; of this use, the Rabbi Kimchi cites a remarkable example from Exod. xxi. 15, where it says, "And he that smiteth his father *or* his mother, shall be surely put to death." The Hebrew is, in this case, as in the last clause of the vow of Jephthah, connected by the particle *vau*, consequently the passage in Judges may be read, Whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house shall surely be the Lord's, *or* I will offer it up for a burnt offering. The Hebrew text makes the vow to consist of two parts, each having a different signification, thus, "It shall be the Lord's, or it shall be a victim." It may be necessary to remark, that the Vulgate has translated the beginning of the verse by the words *Quicumque primus egressus fuerit*, using the masculine gender, in the same manner the Greek, the

Syriac, and the Abriac have rendered the passage, but as Lyra learnedly remarks, where the the Latin and other languages embrace all genders under the neuter, the Hebrew, on the contrary, comprehends all under the masculine. Hence, according to Kimchi, referred to by Marsham in his *Canon Chronicus*; the vow means, "It shall be consecrated to the Lord, if it be not fit for a burnt offering, or I will offer it as a burnt offering should it be suitable." (*Erit Domino consecratum si non sit idoneum holocausto; aut offeram eum holocaustum, si fuerit holocausto idoneum*, sec. iv. cap. 3.) and the conclusion of the event, which says, "he did with her according to his vow which he had vowed," according to the same author means, He made her a house and put her in it, and there she remained secluded from the sons of men, and worldly affairs. (*Fecit ei domum et introduxit in eam, atque ibi remansit seclusa a filiis hominum et a rebus secularibus.*)

It appears strange that after so much light has been thrown on the interpretation of this passage, that all modern critics have not endeavored to render this fact more agreeable to reason, and more conformable to the Jewish Law. It cannot be supposed that Jepthah could, without the crime of rashness, promise to God a sacrifice of human blood, and especially of his own blood, for on returning home he could not expect that an enemy, a slave, or a stranger, would be the first to come out of his house to congratulate him on his victory, or welcome his return; he would be rather led to suppose that it would be either his wife or his only daughter; for the Scriptures inform us that he had been driven from his home by his brothers, on account of being the son of a concubine. He knew well that human sacrifices were an abomination to God, and that it was these detestable sacrifices to Moloch which had excited the anger of the Almighty against the Canaanites. The sacrifice of Isaac was not the spontaneous oblation of Abraham, but the command of the Almighty, as a trial of the faith of the patriarch, and the divine interference prevented its accomplishment. Homicide, too, was not permitted by the Deity, except in cases of legal punishment for crime, or in just wars against profane nations; in these cases men did not follow their own wills, but were the ministers of God's vengeance.

The first born were offered by divine appointment to the Lord, but then they might be redeemed at a small price, and were not slain; and if men or slaves offered themselves to God, they remained engaged in, the service of religion, and were not sacrificed in the manner of beasts. How can it be supposed that a father who exhibited such marks of tenderness by rending his garments when his daughter met him, would not have availed himself of the provisions of the law by redeeming her with money? Where, too, could so cruel a spectacle take place? It could not take place in Gilead, where Jepthah resided, for the law required every sacrifice to take place in the tabernacle. The command of God was explicit on this point, and is repeated no fewer than three times in Deuteronomy. "But unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes, to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither shalt thou come." Deut. xii. 5. In the 11th verse it is more clearly expressed. "Then there shall be a place which the Lord your God shall choose, to cause his name to dwell

there; thither shall ye bring all that I command your; your burnt offerings and sacrifices, your tithes, and the heave offering of your hand, and all your choice vows which ye vow unto the Lord:" and in the 26th verse it says, "thy vows thou shalt take, and go into the place which the Lord shall choose.

If then it was only in the tabernacle in which a victim could be offered, how could the high priest and the other ministers of the sacred place permit the sanctuary to be profaned by a sacrifice which God himself had prohibited? Who, again, could be the minister who would perform the sacrifice? Certainly not any of the priests could put his knife to the throat of an innocent virgin, and perform a rite so expressly contrary to the laws and the ceremonial precepts of the place. It was an oblation that could not be performed by one of the people, nor could the father imbrue his hands in the innocent blood of his child; he had no right or title to perform the priest's office. He was not of the family of Levi, to whom the duty of performing these rites belonged; consequently, had he polluted his hands with the blood of his child, it would not have been a sacrifice, but a homicide. The deed could not have been performed in the place appointed, and had it been performed elsewhere it would have been considered no longer a sacrifice, but a profanation of a sacred ordinance. And suppose such a deed contrary to the law and custom commanded by the Almighty to have been performed, how could the Scriptures pass over so atrocious an act with merely remarking that the father had done with his daughter according to his vow which he had vowed. But, in opposition to this improbable conjecture, there are still insuperable objections, which are, that the altar, in cases of sacrifices, whether they were peace offerings, or for the sins of the priest, the ruler, of the people, was to be sprinkled with the blood of the victim, and certain parts were to be consumed on the altar, while, if the victim offered was for a vow, which would be the case of Jephthah's daughter, the skin belonged to the priests, and the law required that the flesh was to be eaten by the priests and ministers on the day that the sacrifice was offered, and if any of the flesh remained it was to be eaten on the next day. (See Lev. viii. 16.) How could this be done? Is it supposed that the victim might, in this instance, be burnt entire, and then buried? This could not take place in an offering made for a vow, for only when the victim sacrificed was for a sin offering, could it be burnt without the tabernacle; but even then, the fat and inward parts were to be burnt upon the altar. For a human victim there could be no separate rite, because God had never permitted such an oblation, and without a rite the priests could not gird up themselves to the performance of so inhuman a ceremony.

How, indeed, could the vow be supposed to have any reference to her death, when we see how quickly the daughter resigned herself to her father's decree. She only requested a delay of two months, that she might go into the mountains, not to bewail her death, but to lament her infelicity. If she had to die, why should her state of singleness be a source of misery? but if she had to live it would be so, because among the Jews it was considered a greater misfortune to be without offspring, than to die. At the end of two months, as the Sacred Record informs us, she returned to her father, who did with her according to his vow,

and it is added, she knew no man. If this last expression relates to her former state, the text, having informed us that she was a virgin, the remark is superfluous or frivolous, [*sembra un' inutile spiegazione.*] It appears rather to relate to her condition after the execution of the vow.

There is another difficulty which has arisen from the 40th verse of the chapter, which commemorates the lamentation of the Israelitish women, four days every year, for the daughter of Jephthah. It has been asked, if she did not die, why was this mourning made for her and not for her celibacy, her seclusion from the world, and the hardship of her condition, which cut her off from the enjoyments of domestic life, &c. ? This error, perhaps, originated from the vulgate translation ; but if we turn to the Hebrew, we shall not only find a solution of the difficulty, but a still further confirmation for believing that the vow had reference to her continued seclusion, and not to her death. The vulgate says, "It was a custom, that the daughters of Israel should assemble together and lament the daughter of Jephthah, [*convenient in unum filia Israel et plangant filiam Jephthae,*]" which the Septuagint version renders 'the daughters Israel went to lament the daughter of Jephthah,' and the Chaldee paraphrase says, the daughters of Israel came to lament the daughter of Jephthah." The sense of these latter passages differs from the vulgate as to the mode. The Latin version indicates a meeting in any place, while the other two versions seem to intimate that the daughters of Israel went to the place in which the daughter of Jephthah was. The Hebrew, however, removes every difficulty. The word translated by these different versions to *lament*, signifies not only to lament, but likewise to *console*, or to *talk with*, (*dare trattenimento*, which has a double meaning, like the French *entretenir*, or the English, entertain; used in the sense of, to support, or converse with.) From this it is evident that there is a great difference in the signification, since to lament, implies to mourn for the dead, while to console or talk with, supposes that the object of discourse is still alive. In short, the interlineary translation of the Hebrew in the Polyglott, renders the verb in this passage *ad alloquendum*,* meaning that the daughters of Israel went from time to time to condole or converse with the daughter of Jephthah, which is an additional proof that the execution of the vow of Jephthah was an oblation of his daughter's integrity to a life of seclusion or devotion, and not an inhuman sacrifice terminating in an effusion of his daughter's blood.

W. S. W.

Note.—The opinion of this author, has been that of the most learned and enlightened commentators in every age and every country. See Dr. Randolph's translation of this passage, Bagster's Comprehensive Bible, in loc. also, Horne's Introduction, Vol. I. p. 411, and Bish. Sandford's Diary. Besides Lyra and Kimchi, many of the Jewish Rabbis maintain that the vow was executed by separating the daughter from the world, and thus rendering her civilly dead. This view is the proper interpretation of the law Cherem, or anathema; by this law every Israelite could dispose of all that he possessed, animate or inanimate, as an absolute irredeemable grant to God. This law decreed, that "no devoted thing that a man shall devote unto the Lord of all that he hath, both of man and beast, and of the field of his possession, shall be sold or redeemed: every devoted thing is most holy unto the Lord. None devoted, which shall be devoted of men,

*Stock translates this passage, "ad colloquendum, confabulandum cum filia Jephthae," and Kimchi, "eam amicis colloquiis de virginitate et statu vite solitario consolantur."

shall be redeemed; but shall surely be put to death. (Lev. xxvii. 28, 29) The meaning of which is, that every clean beast thus devoted, was sacrificed: if unclean, it was slain; if a field or house was devoted, it remained forever the property of the priests; and if a human being, he or she, remained devoted to the service of God to the end of life, or in other words, died in that state. But if the enemies of the children of Israel fell under this anathema by the decree of the Almighty, as the Canaanites, they were put to death. From this state of the Jewish law, we may safely conclude the daughter of Jephthah was not immolated.—*Pro. Episcopalian.*

ON PROTRACTED MEETINGS.

Against uniting in them, the reasons assigned by Mr. Nott, a Presbyterian Minister, are briefly these:

1. His incompetency in point of health to a task, to which in truth, he considers all men incompetent. 2. A protracted meeting is no ordinance of God, and in regard to it, he is at liberty and under obligation to act, according to his own best judgment. 3. It is a mistaken measure. 4. It is out of keeping with the whole course of his ministry. 5. He hopes for free course to God's word without it. 6. The measure ought to be declined, because it claims to itself the honor due only to the word, the ordinances, and the Spirit of God. These reasons are amplified and illustrated satisfactorily in the two or three pages devoted to them in the pamphlet.

We have no doubt ourselves of the validity of these reasons. And others might be added, at least as important specifications, under one or other of these general charges against protracted meetings. And if we are not very much deceived, the great majority of our brethren and of the reflecting members of our Churches, feel with us on the subject. *Time*, which proves all things, is now demonstrating the evil influences attendant on them; in the fitfulness of religious feeling throughout Zion; in the wide spread spiritual languor of the Churches; in the increased hardness of the hearts of the multitude; in the abounding of infidelity; in the filling up of the Churches with unworthy members; in the spread of Arminianism, Antinomianism and Perfectionism; in the alienation of ministers and their people resulting in frequent dismissals, and in almost universal distrust of every doctrine preached, and movement made by the most faithful servants of God; and in the doubts every where felt, and often expressed, of the genuineness of reported revivals, when they are preceded by a "protracted meeting."

We love the work of God, unless our heart utterly deceives us. But, we fear the work of man. And that the work of man predominates in "four days," "twenty days," and "forty days' meetings," we have no doubt. It is not the ordinance of God. It is not the work of God. And though some souls *may* be saved through the instrumentality of such excitements, they are saved as by fire; and the same fire *devours* myriads more, who but for such excitements of man's creation, might have remained within reach of the arm of mercy. It is time, high time that this subject were more carefully examined and better understood, by those whom God has commissioned to lead on the sacramental host of his elect to battle and to victory."

and it is added, she knew no man. If this last expression relates to her former state, the text, having informed us that she was a virgin, the remark is superfluous or frivolous, [sembra un' inutile spiegazione.] It appears rather to relate to her condition after the execution of the vow.

There is another difficulty which has arisen from the 40th verse of the chapter, which commemorates the lamentation of the Israelitish women, four days every year, for the daughter of Jephthah. It has been asked, if she did not die, why was this mourning made for her and not for her celibacy, her seclusion from the world, and the hardship of her condition, which cut her off from the enjoyments of domestic life, &c. ? This error, perhaps, originated from the vulgate translation ; but if we turn to the Hebrew, we shall not only find a solution of the difficulty, but a still further confirmation for believing that the vow had reference to her continued seclusion, and not to her death. The vulgate says, "It was a custom, that the daughters of Israel should assemble together and lament the daughter of Jephthah, [*convenient in unum filia Israel et plangant filiam Jephe,*] which the Septuagint version renders 'the daughters Israel went to lament the daughter of Jephthah,' and the Chaldee paraphrase says, the daughters of Israel came to lament the daughter of Jephthah." The sense of these latter passages differs from the vulgate as to the mode. The Latin version indicates a meeting in any place, while the other two versions seem to intimate that the daughters of Israel went to the place in which the daughter of Jephthah was. The Hebrew, however, removes every difficulty. The word translated by these different versions to *lament*, signifies not only to lament, but likewise to *console*, or to *talk with*, (*dare trattenimento*, which has a double meaning, like the French *entretenir*, or the English, entertain; used in the sense of, to support, or converse with.) From this it is evident that there is a great difference in the signification, since to lament, implies to mourn for the dead, while to console or talk with, supposes that the object of discourse is still alive. In short, the interlineary translation of the Hebrew in the Polyglott, renders the verb in this passage *ad alloquendum*,* meaning that the daughters of Israel went from time to time to condole or converse with the daughter of Jephthah, which is an additional proof that the execution of the vow of Jephthah was an oblation of his daughter's integrity to a life of seclusion or devotion, and not an inhuman sacrifice terminating in an effusion of his daughter's blood.

W. S. W.

Note.—The opinion of this author, has been that of the most learned and enlightened commentators in every age and every country. See Dr. Randolph's translation of this passage, Bagster's Comprehensive Bible, in loc. also, Horne's Introduction, Vol. I. p. 411, and Bish. Sandford's Diary. Besides Lyra and Kimchi, many of the Jewish Rabbis maintain that the vow was executed by separating the daughter from the world, and thus rendering her civilly dead. This view is the proper interpretation of the law Cherem, or anathema; by this law every Israelite could dispose of all that he possessed, animate or inanimate, as an absolute irredeemable grant to God. This law decreed, that "no devoted thing that a man shall devote unto the Lord of all that he hath, both of man and beast, and of the field of his possession, shall be sold or redeemed: every devoted thing is most holy unto the Lord. None devoted, which shall be devoted of men,

* Stock translates this passage, "ad colloquendum, confabulandum cum filia Jepthæ," and Kimchi, "cum amicis colloquiis de virginitate et statu vite solitario consolantur."

shall be redeemed; but shall surely be put to death. (Lev. xxvii. 28, 29) The meaning of which is, that every clean beast thus devoted, was sacrificed: if unclean, it was slain; if a field or house was devoted, it remained forever the property of the priests; and if a human being, he or she, remained devoted to the service of God to the end of life, or in other words, died in that state. But if the enemies of the children of Israel fell under this anathema by the decree of the Almighty, as the Canaanites, they were put to death. From this state of the Jewish law, we may safely conclude the daughter of Jephthah was not immolated.—*Pro. Episcopalian.*

ON PROTRACTED MEETINGS.

Against uniting in them, the reasons assigned by Mr. Nott, a Presbyterian Minister, are briefly these:

1. His incompetency in point of health to a task, to which in truth, he considers all men incompetent. 2. A protracted meeting is no ordinance of God, and in regard to it, he is at liberty and under obligation to act, according to his own best judgment. 3. It is a mistaken measure. 4. It is out of keeping with the whole course of his ministry. 5. He hopes for free course to God's word without it. 6. The measure ought to be declined, because it claims to itself the honor due only to the word, the ordinances, and the Spirit of God. These reasons are amplified and illustrated satisfactorily in the two or three pages devoted to them in the pamphlet.

We have no doubt ourselves of the validity of these reasons. And others might be added, at least as important specifications, under one or other of these general charges against protracted meetings. And if we are not very much deceived, the great majority of our brethren and of the reflecting members of our Churches, feel with us on the subject. *Time*, which proves all things, is now demonstrating the evil influences attendant on them; in the fitfulness of religious feeling throughout Zion; in the wide spread spiritual languor of the Churches; in the increased hardness of the hearts of the multitude; in the abounding of infidelity; in the filling up of the Churches with unworthy members; in the spread of Arminianism, Antinomianism and Perfectionism; in the alienation of ministers and their people resulting in frequent dismissals, and in almost universal distrust of every doctrine preached, and movement made by the most faithful servants of God; and in the doubts every where felt, and often expressed, of the genuineness of reported revivals, when they are preceded by a "protracted meeting."

We love the work of God, unless our heart utterly deceives us. But, we fear the work of man. And that the work of man predominates in "four days," "twenty days," and "forty days' meetings," we have no doubt. It is not the ordinance of God. It is not the work of God. And though some souls *may* be saved through the instrumentality of such excitements, they are saved as by fire; and the same fire *devours* myriads more, who but for such excitements of man's creation, might have remained within reach of the arm of mercy. It is time, high time that this subject were more carefully examined and better understood, by those whom God has commissioned to lead on the sacramental host of his elect to battle and to victory."

SOUND PRINCIPLE.

From the "Church" and "Churchman."

Our own Church demands ALL that we can spare from our worldly substance ; and even if a pious munificence, such as it would be contrary to experience to hope for, were really exercised, there would after all be waste places in Canada destitute of the regular ministrations of our communion. We are, therefore, called upon to be just before we are generous ; and ere we go abroad, as it were, and unite with separatists on any common ground, it becomes us to take heed that the wants of our own family *at home* be adequately supplied. Some most estimable and conscientious Churchmen, we are aware, are members of religious societies which have no connexion whatever with the Established Church ; and with such we would not venture to expostulate for a moment, if, in our own societies, they could not attain the same objects for which they unite with parties who are, in general, hostile to our Episcopacy and our Ritual, and who never contribute a farthing where our Church is solely interested. 'Come out from among them,' we honestly and fearlessly say :—'Assist not in giving influence to individuals, who use it to the destruction of those sacred institutions which you are pledged to uphold ; take not from the children that bread which they crave, in order to bestow it upon strangers ; interfere with no man's religious liberty or rights of conscience ; but faithfully support your own Church, before you proffer aid to those who are perchance plotting its destruction.'

"These observations may provoke an outcry that we are bigoted, exclusive and intolerant ; but such unfounded censure we utterly disregard. From interested parties we may anticipate the accusation ; from honest and conscientious Churchmen,—the persons to whom we are addressing ourselves,—we fear nothing from a calm prosecution of inquiry and reflection.

From the Churchman.

PRACTICE OF FREQUENTING DIFFERENT PLACES OF WORSHIP.

Let me ask whether the too common practice of frequenting different places of worship, is not one that should be discountenanced by every person professedly and avowedly a Christian ? It is a lamentable fact, and we see it every day verified, that many for the purpose of having their ears tickled with new sounds, and their imaginations whirled by gaudy eloquence, will suffer themselves to be led away from the fold to which they belong, and wander hither and thither in search of what, when found, is of little or no real benefit to them. The word of God, truth and virtue, are forever the same ; and it is not always that extraordinary oratorical sublimity, fervor of tone, and impassionate delivery, are the surest methods of imbuing the heart with that constancy to their precepts, and devotion to their guidance, which is the result of true piety and godliness. An appeal to the feelings and sensibilities of our nature, does oftentimes produce an effect of longer or shorter duration ; and as often does it attract our attention and admiration only by bringing gratification rather than devotion ; but an appeal to these feelings and to sound sense and reason, such as is presented by our beautiful

liturgy, touches the heart's core, and its radiations light up the beacon to everlasting life and happiness; and whether taught by graceful eloquence and studied gesture, or by the untutored tongue, it ever retains the momentous principles of the Gospel in all their authority and truth. With this treasure, reeking as it does with the dew of the Bible, stored in our hearts, we cannot, we dare not rest our hopes of future bliss upon the quicksand foundation of extatic raptures and irresistible impulses, but upon the prescribed law of God alone, which teacheth faith, obedience, and a humble walking after righteousness. I am well aware that many who follow in the wake of so-styled popular preachers,—if they are of different persuasion from themselves,—conceive their religious principles to be so fixed and deeply planted, as to defy a whirlwind of eloquence to uproot them. This may be; but nevertheless, the influence of their example is pernicious, and can be used as an argument why others should do likewise; and though they feel themselves secure, they may prove the bait to draw those more susceptible, into a net well calculated to entrap the unwary.

PRO BONO PUBLICO.

From the Churchman.

CHARITY WELL DEFINED.

We are bound to love all men, to love all professed Christians, of whatever name; but our love ought to be guided by truth; so far as it is so guided, it is the charity of the Gospel; so far as it is not so guided, it is allowed with human weakness. The Church, as such, provides for the manifestation of charity; i. e. of love in harmony with truth. She keeps her Liturgy, the catholic digest of God's Word, ever prominent. She does not permit her clergy to preach a sermon or lecture, without the Liturgy. She does not permit them to introduce ministers of other denominations into her pulpits: she thus bears witness to the truth, and withholds her countenance from error. This provision is sometimes thought uncharitable; and it would be so, if it were not of the essence of charity to move in harmony with truth: it might be so, if the Liturgy were the collected opinions or judgment of Protestant Episcopalians, as such, and not the essential truth of the Word of God, as proclaimed by the Catholic Church. For if there be one essential truth of the Bible which our Church has not retained, then she has fallen from the faith, and does not exercise the genuine charity of the Gospel, but is practising in its stead the spurious virtue of heretics. Or, if there be one matter of human opinion which she has incorporated in her services as the truth of God's Word, then she has added to the Word of God, and is so far from possessing the spirit of charity, that she is in fact the author of schism and deserves the anathema of all true Christians, and "the plagues which are written in the Book of Life." All the truth which the Church delivers from the WORD OF GOD, is a part of God's holy will and commandments, which her members are bound by their baptism obediently to follow. This truth is the law of Christian love, obedience to which is charity. The members of the Church, therefore, are bound to follow her rule and example. They are to love all men, and to seek to do them good as citizens, neighbors, friends and brethren, by all the kind offices of humanity in their power. This is

X agreeable to the Word of God, and therefore required by Christian charity. But charity does not require us to bolster men up in their errors; it does not require us to worship at strange altars, nor to frequent the ministrations of those whom God has not sent, nor to approve by thought, word or deed, of any professed Christians in aught in which they have departed from the faith of Christ. It does not require us to say to the Arian, the Socinian, or the Humanitarian, "Our difficulties, my dear brethren, may be avoided by distinguishing between the being of Christ and his perfection; all of us believe in one Being, but you have the benefits of his example and resurrection, and we have the benefits of his divinity." Neither does it require us to say to those who have departed from the Church, which is the body of Christ, "Our difficulties, my dear brethren, may be removed by distinguishing between the being of the Church and the perfection of the same; all of us believe in one Church, but you have the benefits of the Church as you have made it, and we have the benefits of the same Church as Christ has left it." Whatever such acts or words may be, they are not the proofs and expressions of charity; for charity is love, moving in obedience to divine truth. They never preserved the Church from heresy in the primitive age, and they will never promote lasting peace, nor contribute to bring back professed Christians to unity in the present age.

From the *Utica Gospel Messenger*.

ON EPISCOPACY.

The only argument from antiquity, (perhaps the fairest argument which the Anti-Episcopalian advocate can produce,) is derived from the opinion of the heretic Aërius. This person was the first and only real opponent of Episcopacy in the ancient Church. He flourished about the middle of the fourth century. The occasion of his heresy was his envy of Eustathius, who though of equal age, and of the same qualifications, was preferred before him to the Bishopric of Sebastia, in Pontus, for which both were candidates. No concessions on the part of his successful rival, (who regretted the mortification which he had innocently caused) could appease the resentment of Aërius. The latter proceeded to calumniate Eustathius: to designate the new prelate as proud, overbearing, and avaricious; to withdraw himself from the communion of the Church; and to publish a variety of heretical opinions, more especially, the opinion, that he himself, though a Presbyter, was of equal honor and dignity with Eustathius, and that by the word of God no difference was recognized between Presbyters and their Bishop. No circumstance gives importance to the opinion of this obscure Presbyter, but that he is the only individual among all the ancients, who really gives support to the anti-Episcopalian, or, as it has been called from him, the *Aërian* cause. But after all, on examination, that support seems extremely feeble and insignificant. He is, as already noticed, a very late authority, for he did not publish his novelties till about the middle of the fourth century: his mind was warped by motives of private interest and resentment: he quotes no preceding authority for his errors: besides that he neither claimed nor exercised the power of ordination, which is the principal and peculiar prerogative of Episcopacy; his no-

tions were condemned as strange and heretical by the universal Church, and speedily died away.

The use which has been made of this solitary testimony, conveys the insinuation that Aerius, a single Presbyter, was the only individual out of all antiquity who understood the Apostolical constitution of the Church.

Another plausible contrivance of the modern followers of Aerius, is their invention of a new character, a Prime Presbyter, whom they allege to have presided in the colleges of Presbyters, and whom they fancy to be alluded to in all passages of the Fathers that relate to the prerogatives of Bishops. This poetic personage, this creature of the dissenting imagination, was created by David Blondel, a very learned and ingenious Frenchman, employed by the assembly of divines at Westminster, to write a book in support of Presbyterianism, when they found themselves hard pressed by the advocates of Episcopacy. Their Gallician auxiliary, however, was less favorable to the views of the assembly than they expected. For though he wrote a heavy, closely printed quarto in Latin, full of curious research upon the whole, in favor of the Aerian cause, he repeatedly expressed his respect and even reverence for Episcopalian principles, both in the preface and in the body of the work; and entered this solemn protest to the same effect at the conclusion: "By all that we have said in asserting the rights of the Presbyters, we do not intend to invalidate the ancient and apostolical constitution of Episcopal pre-eminence; but we believe that wheresoever it is established conformably to the ancient canons, it must be reverently preserved; and wheresoever by some heat of contention or otherwise, it has been put down, it ought to be reverently restored." Blondel was persuaded to cancel this passage, and the figment of a Prime Presbyter, a thing never before heard of, has ever since been found of great advantage to the propagation of dissenting tenets. The shadowy and indefinite form of this ideal personage, enables the disseminators of schism to assign him whatever attributes, and whatever properties are most convenient to their purpose; and the more they find themselves pressed by the arguments of the defenders of Apostolic discipline within the Church, the more nearly do they mould the resemblance between a Prime Presbyter and a Bishop, till hardly any difference at last can be perceived between them. When the controversy begins, this Prime Presbyter is only an occasional moderator of the Presbytery; as the argument proceeds, he is made to hold the moderatorship for life; then the rights of jurisdiction and coercion are liberally assigned him; and at last the power of ordination cannot be exercised without him. Here then, we can only say, that we attach no value to mere words. If the dissenter will allow his moderator to be invested with Episcopal authority, we are entirely satisfied. "Let us then," to quote the words of Leslie, "have a moderator, like the Bishops, in the writings of the Fathers, namely, a moderator as a standing officer, during life, to whom all the Presbyters are to be obedient, as to Christ, that is, to the moderator as representing the person of Christ; that nothing can be done without him; that he be understood as the principle of unity in his Church, so that they who unjustly break off from his communion are thereby in a schism; that he show his succession by regular ordination

conveyed down from the Apostles; in short, that he have all that character and authority which we see to have been recognized in the Bishops in the very age of the Apostles, and all the succeeding ages of Christianity: and then call him moderator, superintendent, or bishop; for the contest is not about the name, but the thing."—*Sinclair*.

FASTS AND FESTIVALS.

The human mind seems to have been organized in a way to require the notice of seasons and days for celebrating particular mercies and for deprecating evils. Hence we see that our New-England ancestors, when they repudiated the festivals of the Church and passed laws against observing Christmas, found it necessary to establish an Autumnal thanksgiving—and as they would not notice Good Friday and the season of Lent, they always had, and still keep, a *fast day*, in every spring. We have no special list, for any particular sin, or the encouragement of any particular virtue, because all the duties of self-denial, of humble control of ourselves are enforced in the most solemn manner during the season of Lent, and urged in all our offices. We have no particular days set apart on account of the Missionary cause, for this plain reason: during the season of Epiphany, the Church has a special reference to the manifestation of our Saviour, to the blessings which flow from a promulgation of the gospel, and to the means which we ought to employ in advancing the measures required for the increase of the knowledge of God through our own land and the world.—*Utica Gospel Messenger*.

DUTY OF PARENTS.

There is one excellent practice of former times, which I fear is falling more and more into neglect, even in pious families. Our fathers and mothers, used to make a point of questioning their children upon the sermons, "after meeting," in order to find out what they recollected, to quicken and improve their memories, and by a concise repetition of the most important truths, to impress them more deeply upon their consciences. This habit is of great advantage to parents as well as children; and by persevering in it, almost any parent will find himself able to conduct the exercise with a good degree of ease and advantage. Ours is an age of more *hearing*, than *thinking* and *remembering* and *digesting*. Too many, who feel as if they could hardly live without three sermons a day, greatly neglect the religious instruction of their families at home, and excuse themselves by the plea, that they have no time, or that they are too much fatigued with hearing, to do any thing else. This is permitting one duty to crowd out another; or rather it is, except in extraordinary cases, hearing *one* sermon too much for their own profit, to the neglect of those fire-side duties, which, by the blessing of God, would be of the highest advantage to their children.

Dr. Humphrey.

The two original Commandments.—Man in Paradise received two injunctions from his Maker and two only, to keep holy the seventh day, and to abstain from a particular fruit, which if he eat he would incur death as a certain consequence.

FOR THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.

ENGLISH BISHOPS.

I think it is Adam Clark remarks, "that taken as a body, there can no where be found an equal number of Christian Ministers, who have been more learned, intellectually gifted, or exemplary in their lives, or who have thrown around the common citadel of our hopes, stronger bulwarks of defence, than the bench of English Bishops." The following short sketches are extracts from a late publication by a Minister of our Church, travelling in Europe.

Bishop of Chester.—The uncompromising friend of evangelical religion, author of the "Expositions of the Gospel," which have been republished in our country—he is a very mild and amiable looking man; rather thin in appearance, and of a comparatively feeble voice. He appears at all times the avowed advocate of all objects which Christian benevolence is endeavoring to set forward. He is bold and fearless in the avowal of his sentiments.

Bishop of Chichester.—His voice is feeble, and his remarks but imperfectly heard. In appearance, he is a plain looking man, tall, thin, and emaciated; his head thickly sprinkled with gray hairs. There appears to be but little ardor in his feelings, or any remarkable indication of brilliancy in his thoughts.

Bishop of London.—The Bishop of London is a noble looking man, well proportioned and symmetrical in form, with an open, intelligent, speaking countenance; considered by some as possessing a reserve and hauteur, that keep his friends at a distance from him. I have seldom met with one more kind and affable, and unpretending, than he appeared, while at the same time there was a graceful and manly dignity that characterized his deportment.

Bishop of Ripon.—He is a fine looking man, with dark eyes and black hair, and is partially bald. He speaks with occasional hesitancy, as though at a loss for the right word, but with evident good sense and pious feeling. The Bishop, I presume, is one of those who look upon all new modes of doing good, with exceeding jealousy, and who think it wise to guard with most rigid vigilance against the slightest approximation to an infringement upon ministerial prerogative.

A READER.

MADRAS.

Extract from a letter from the Bishop of Madras to the Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

Lay Readers.—At Madras are appended certain out-stations, many of them situated at a great distance from his usual place of abode. At each of these out-stations the chaplain has the nominal charge of a little flock, whom he visits at stated periods, under the sanction of the bishop; but where his visits are unavoidably few, and at distant intervals; and during his absence he is obliged to confide the reading of the prayers and his sermon on Sunday to some resident layman, who, in many instances, proves himself an able as well willing coadjutor of the non-resident clergyman."

POETRY.

[Selected by a Lady for the Gospel Messenger.]

NOT LOST, BUT GONE BEFORE!

Say, why should friendship grieve for those
Who safe arrive on Canaan's shore?
Releas'd from all their hurtful foes,
They are not lost—but gone before.

How many painful days on earth
Their fainting spirits number'd o'er!
Now they enjoy a heav'nly birth,
They are not lost—but gone before.

Dear is the spot where Christian's sleep,
And sweet the strains which angels pour;
Oh why should we in anguish weep?
They are not lost—but gone before.

Secure from ev'ry mortal care,
By sin and sorrow vexed no more,
Eternal happiness they share,
Who are not lost—but gone before.

To Zion's peaceful courts above,
In faith triumphant may we soar,
Embracing in the arms of love,
The friends not lost—but gone before.

On Jordan's bank whene'er we come,
And hear the swelling waters roar,
Jesus, convey us safely home,
To friends not lost—but gone before.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Pinckney Lecture.—It was delivered at St. Philip's Church on the 1st Wednesday in June, having been postponed from the time named in the Will, (viz., the "Wednesday after the second Tuesday in May.") The Rev. the Rector of St. Michael's Church, Charleston, was the lecturer, and his text was, "Behold the goodness and severity of God."

Monthly Missionary Lectures.—Those for June and July, were delivered by the Rev. Rector of St. Peter's Church. His subject, was a review of the result of Missions among the heathen throughout the world. The amount collected was, in June, \$24; in July, \$25.

Consecration of our Bishop.—From the "Church Witness," we extract as follows: "Sunday, the 21st June, was a day of uncommon interest to Episcopalians in Boston. The ceremony of consecration to the Episcopal office had never been witnessed here before, and this first occasion was attended with some circumstances of peculiar interest. It is known to most of our readers that it was to have taken place in the city of Charleston, and in the Church of which Dr. G. has been for many years the esteemed rector. 'Bishop Doane, at the request of the

presiding Bishop, went on for that purpose; but finding Bishop Chase, at Weldon, in North-Carolina, and learning from him that no other bishop would be present, he returned immediately to New-Jersey.* The number required by the canons of the Church is three, and Bishop Ives being detained by ill health, the requisition could not be complied with. Dr. Gadsden then came on to New-York, where the meeting of the Board of Missions, the commencement of the Theological Seminary, and other anniversary meetings, drew together the right reverend fathers of the Church. On Thursday evening, the Rev. Dr. Wainwright arrived in Boston, and announced that the invitation of the presiding Bishop to his right reverend brethren and the Bishop elect, to come to Boston, was accepted, and that they might be expected the next day. Accordingly, on Friday, Bishops Doane of New-Jersey, and McCoskry of Michigan, Dr. Gadsden, the Rev. C. Hanckel, and others, arrived.

The following is from the "Banner of the Cross:" "On Sunday morning last, first Sunday after Trinity, in Trinity Church, Boston, the Rev. Christopher Edwards Gadsden, D. D., Rector of St. Philip's Church, Charleston, Bishop elect of the diocese of South-Carolina, was consecrated to that holy office by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Griswold, Bishop of the Eastern Diocese, and Presiding Bishop; assisted by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Doane, Bishop of New Jersey, and the Rt. Rev. Dr. McCoskry, Bishop of Michigan. Morning prayers were read by the Rev. Dr. Wainwright, of the diocese of New York; the ante Communion Service by the presiding Bishop; the Epistle by the Bishop of Michigan, and the Gospel by the Bishop of New Jersey. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of New Jersey.* The Bishop elect was presented to the presiding Bishop by the Bishops of New Jersey and Michigan. The Bishop of Michigan read the Litany. The testimonials for the consecration of the Bishop elect, were read by the Rev. Dr. Strong and the Rev. Mr. Watson, both of the diocese of Massachusetts. The Bishop elect was assisted in the investiture by the Rev. Mr. Hanckel, of the diocese of South-Carolina, and the Rev. M. Baur of the diocese of Massachusetts. The Holy Communion was administered by the presiding Bishop, assisted by the Bishops of New Jersey, Michigan, and South-Carolina. There were present, of the clergy, the Rev. Dr. Boyle, and the Rev. Messrs. Crowell, Wells, Bartlett, and Parker, of the diocese of Massachusetts; the Rev. Mr. Howe, of the diocese of New Hampshire; and the Rev. Mr. Searle, of the diocese of Michigan. The attendance of a large number of the clergy of the vicinage, was prevented by their engagement in the services of the Lord's day, at their respective parishes. This is the first consecration to the Episcopate which has taken place north and east of New Haven. Its occurrence in Boston was designed by the Bishops assembled in New York, at the Board of Missions, and by the Bishop elect, as a just tribute of respect to their venerated senior. The spectacle in Trinity Church was impressive beyond any we have ever witnessed. The interior of that magnificent edifice, which has recently been painted and improved, and the deep chancel with the noble organ, swayed by a master hand, and sustained by an admirable choir, under the efficient direction of Col. Parker, were all adapted to give to the most solemn service of our

* In compliance with request, this Sermon will be published.

ritual, its best effect. A congregation filling all the aisles, as well as the pews in the body of the church, and the gallery, (hundreds went away for want of room,) testified to its interest and impressiveness, by their devout attention. It was a day to be remembered in New England, and to be noted in the history of the Church in America. A happier illustration of the true doctrine of the "one, holy Catholic, and Apostolic Church," need not be desired than in the consecration, in the remotest northern seat of our episcopacy, of the diocesan from the farthest South, by the Bishop of the Eastern Diocese, assisted by the Bishop of one of our most central, and one of our most western sees. Bishop Gadsden is the thirty-fifth who has been consecrated for this Church, of whom eighteen are now living. We rejoice that the mantle of Dehon and Bowen has fallen on him who was for thirty years their bosom friend, and counsellor; and we beseech Almighty God to shower his choicest blessings on the Bishop and diocese."

Confirmation.—We understand that an opportunity to participate in this sacred rite, will soon be afforded. It was administered at St. Philip's Church in 1835 and 1839; at St. Stephen's, in 1839; at St. Paul's, in 1837; at St. Peter's, in 1836; and at St. Michael's, in 1831. The next administration of it, therefore, in conformity to the custom of alternating in our city Churches, will be at St. Michael's. Considering the changes and chances of this mortal life, it has been deemed best not to delay this ordinance longer than will afford sufficient time to instruct the candidates.

Consecration.—St. John's Chapel, Hampstead, erected for the accommodation of those persons who cannot pay for sittings, it is understood will, Divine providence permitting, be consecrated on Tuesday, July 14th, that day having been preferred in consequence of its being the Anniversary of the Charleston Pro. Epis. Female Dom. Miss. Society—the meritorious institution to which both St. Stephen's and St. John's Chapels are indebted for the means of supporting their Ministers.

Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church.—Its annual meeting was held in New-York, June 17—19. The member from this Diocese was present. A resolution to invite the attention of our Bishops to the sending three Bishops to Texas, was submitted, discussed and postponed. Resolutions of enquiry as to the results of each Mission, were adopted. From the reports of the Committees, it appeared there was a difference in the receipts during the past year, compared with the preceding, in favor of the latter, of 25 per cent. The state of the Mission in Africa, was reported to be particularly encouraging. The Rev. Christian Hanckel was elected a member of the Board in the place of the Rev. C. E. Gadsden, who had been transferred to an *official* seat in the same body.

The Spirit of Missions for June contains the correspondence of 11 Domestic (in 5 States) and 1 Foreign Missionary. Also, the address of the Rev. Dr. Whittingham, and the other proceedings on the occasion of the departure of Rev. H. Southgate, who is to be associated with the Rev. Dr. Robertson, at Constantinople, in a Mission to promote the increase of pure and undefiled religion in the communities of Oriental

Christians ; and more directly that within the pale of the Greek Church in Turkey."

The Missionary in Mississippi writes : "It is the dreadful state of secular things which is now breaking up families that were considered as settled, and which induced me, in a former letter, to express the fear that our little flock, after all, would be wrecked in the general and sweeping gale of pecuniary difficulties that is now thickening and coming upon us. May God preserve and take care of us in the midst of all our distress, and not punish us according to our sins, but in wrath remember mercy. A year or two at most may entirely change the present dreadful aspect of things, but be this as it may, one thing is certain, that pen cannot describe and give you a true picture of the horror that prevails in the countenances of our citizens ; and religion of course, to a greater or less extent, must suffer. Religion will suffer when forced to be depreciated in the estimation of men who are irreligiously absorbed in worldly matters, and who have neither the disposition nor the means to contribute to its support ; and the cause of the Church, under such a state of things, is jeopardized by the breaking up and moving away of families, and the general unsettled condition of the whole community. It is impossible for one to form a correct opinion of the true situation of things in many of these new south-western towns, unless he can be in one of them and observe for himself. To-day they put forth the leaves of hope, to-morrow they are nipped by the frost ; and the third day, as a general rule, they fall to the ground and are gone."

The amount obtained during the month was, for Domestic Missions, \$2608, of which \$617 from South-Carolina ; for Foreign Missions, \$2963, from South-Carolina, \$1137.

General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church.—The annual meeting of the Board of Trustees of this institution, (from which the Church has reaped such rich fruit, and which, under the Divine favor, promises to be more and more useful) was opened at New-York, on the 22d June—two of the Trustees from this Diocese were present. The Board met on five days successively. The students were examined for several hours on three days ; and it was evident, even to a superficial observer, that great pains had been taken to instruct them in Hebrew, in Biblical Criticism, Systematic Divinity, Ecclesiastical History, and Church Polity. The Committee on Examination reported their entire satisfaction ; and 21 young men of the Class, who had finished the course of studies, were recommended for the honorary certificate. On the 26th, there was a large congregation in St. Peter's Church, and after appropriate Collects by the Bishop of Pennsylvania, ten of the first class delivered dissertations on such interesting topics, as 'the Limits of Private Judgment—Meditative Piety—the Design of Fasts and Festivals,' &c. Bishop Ives addressed all the students in a most impressive manner, and with wise counsels, well adapted to the youth before him, and to the times. His subject was humility. Not the least interesting recollection and anticipation on this occasion was derived from the fact, that so many of the alumni and students of this Seminary, are sons of the Clergy. May they have yet more abundant knowledge, zeal, activity and success, than their fathers,—and perhaps we may say

they ought, having the preeminent advantages of this School of the prophets, which has been provided, under the blessing of God, by the foresight of their predecessors. The "associated alumni" passed a resolution to make vigorous efforts to raise the endowment necessary for one of the vacant Professorships, and pledges of various amounts (the highest \$1200) were made by individuals. The Vestry of Trinity Church have stipulated to endow fully one vacant Professorship, on the condition that the other is endowed. The Rev. Peter J. Shand was elected a Trustee to fill the vacancy occasioned by the transferring of the Rev. C. E. Gadsden to an *official* seat in the Board.

Georgia.—From the journal of the 18th annual Convention, held on the 4th and 5th of May, we learn there were present 7 Clergyman and 8 Laymen. "After having united in singing the last two verses of the 76th hymn, and a recess of five minutes for silent prayer, the Convention proceeded by ballot to the election of a Bishop. A division being called for, the nomination of the Clergy was made, whereupon the Rev. Stephen Elliott, jr., "Professor of the Evidences of Christianity and of Sacred Literature in the College of South-Carolina," was *unanimously* presented to the Laity for their acceptance. On ballot by the Laity, it was announced that there was a *unanimous concurrence* of both orders of the Convention, in the choice of the Rev. Mr. Elliott as Bishop of the Diocese of Georgia." In his report, the Missionary, the Rev. Mr. Hunt, says, "In every place I visit, I find some of our household of faith "scattered like sheep upon the mountains," with no man to gather them or care for their souls, who still retain for the Church of their choice a warm attachment, and long for an opportunity of again uniting in her sweet communion, but to whom, when hope has been deferred till the heart has become faint, the conclusion presents itself, "we have no shepherd," and they unite with other denominations from what they deem *necessity*, and not choice. Religious privileges they *must* have, and finding in these connections that which will be better than the entire want of *any*, their attachments become so strong that it is difficult to sever them, and thus they are lost to the Church. Instances of this are not rare, where, had they been favored with the services of their own Church, such a result could not have been even suspected."

Maryland.—The annual diocesan Convention was held May 27—29. Present, 61 of the Clergy and 68 of the Laity. The Rev. Dr. Whittingham was elected Bishop, having out of 57 votes of the Clergy, 50; and of the Lay votes, 57 out of 64. In his letter, Dr. W. writes: "I believe that God is with his Church in all its doings, and therefore *dare* make no other reply than an acceptance of the appointment to the vacant Bishopric of your diocess. My own judgment is entirely at variance with this decision, in all points: but I do not presume to look to it in such a matter. Our Lord and Master, who permitted you to unite in the selection of one so unworthy, is able to make the most unworthy sufficient for his work, and *I will trust Him*, and *you in Him*, in a matter the most momentous, as I verily believe, in which mortal man can be called upon to come to a decision. When experience shall have made you more acquainted with my failings, you will remember that you act against my

desire, most earnestly expressed to those who afforded me the opportunity, gave the occasion for their display, and will bear with me, and strengthen my weakness, and share my work. I have no hope before me but in the undeserved mercies of God through Christ, and in your forbearance and long-suffering love. For these mercies I entreat you to pray, and procure for me the prayers of those in whose name you act."

There are in this Diocese 73 Clergymen.

Monument in St. Michael's Cemetery.—It has recently been erected, with the following inscription:

SACRED TO THE MEMORY
OF

THE REV. PHILANDER CHASE, JUNIOR,

Who departed this life in this city of Charleston, So. Ca.

On the first day of March, A. D. 1824. Æ. 24.

The Sermon at his funeral, preached by his friend,

THE REV. EDWARD RUTLEDGE,

was re-printed in England, and instrumental
in turning many to righteousness.

"Some glorify God, by their lives,"

"He by his death."

His father, once of Ohio,

Now the Bishop of Illinois,

Visiting this city in February, 1840,

caused this stone to be erected

In testimony of his never-dying love
to his deceased Son,

And of his gratitude to all, who
by their Christian hospitality

and kindness,

Alleviated his sufferings, and by

their sympathy and prayers,

Soothed his dying pillow.

Monument in the Cemetery of St. Mary's Church, Burlington, New-Jersey.—The readers of the "Gospel Messenger" were much interested with a notice in a former number, of the life and character of the late Assistant Minister of the Church above named, and they will be not less so with the following epitaph and description of the monument erected to his memory.

SACRED TO THE MEMORY
OF

THE REV. BENJAMIN DAVIS WINSLOW, A. M.,

Assistant to the Rector of St. Mary's Church;

WHO DIED

November 21, 1839,

In the twenty-fifth year of his age,

"Looking unto Jesus."

The Bishop of New-Jersey,

to whom he was as a son,

thus sorrows for him as a father,

but not as they who have no hope;

Since them who sleep with Jesus

Will God bring with him.

The Monument, by the Artist, John Struthers, is of Italian marble, and has an ornamented head. The device is—I H S, with the Cross, most ingeniously combined, on a Gothic Shield.

Respect for the Lord's Day.—A gentleman who resides at Brighton, where is located one of the most beautiful summer palaces of England's Sovereign, owns a magnificent property there called the Park. In the true spirit of Christianity, he had given directions to his servants residing at the Porter's Lodge, that no person should be permitted to enter in on the Sabbath. One Sunday, however, Victoria, in taking her accustomed airing, applied at the gate for admission to drive through the Park. The man, who kept the gate, however, unabashed by her royal presence, said that he had strict orders not to admit any person on the Sabbath, and he dare not disobey those orders. Of course, the royal carriage was obliged to turn back, and was not permitted to cross even the threshold of the Park. How much is it to be wished that every man in the realm had such a fear and reverence for the authority and laws of the King of Kings, that no earthly power should constrain them to desecrate the Sabbath.

Obituary Notice.

Departed this life on the 18th ult. Miss HARRIOTE H. BLAKE, of this city. A protracted and painful disease tested, a naturally amiable and patient disposition, and afforded satisfactory evidence that the good qualities with which nature had endowed her, had been improved by the precepts of that religion which for years she had openly professed and assiduously practised. Knowing that "whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth" she bore his visitation with the fortitude and meekness of a sincere christian, never uttering a complaint and only repining that she should be the cause of anxiety and care to her friends who were solicitous to relieve her sufferings and restore her health. Her last moments afforded the strongest evidence of the power of the religion of Christ in overcoming the dread of death and rendering smooth and tranquil the passage from time to eternity. She had often expressed a great apprehension of this severe trial to which all are subjected who are conscious of their approaching dissolution. But the Christian knows where to seek succour, and her prayers for strength and support in that trying hour had been zealously addressed in faith to her Saviour, and they were answered in loving kindness—for while yet in health some months since she said that all her fears of death had been removed, and the closing scene of her life gave assurance that she was not mistaken. Blessed with the full possession of her mind to within a very few moments of her dissolution, she viewed with the most perfect composure the approach of that messenger which was to call her hence, never once expressing a desire to prolong her sojourn on earth, but calmly communicating to her surrounding friends the wishes which she desired them to fulfil after death. Disclaiming all merits of her own, she declared her reliance to be upon the all sufficient atonement of her once crucified, but now exalted Lord, and calmly yielded her spirit to God.

CALENDAR FOR JULY.

5. 3d Sunday after Trinity.	25. St. James.
12. 4th Sunday after Trinity.	26. 6th Sunday after Trinity.
19. 5th Sunday after Trinity.	

ERRATA.

In page 100, line 31 from end, for "declaration," read recollection.

" 116, " 16 from top, for "particularly," read practically.

In June number, page 74, line 17 from top, instead of "is low of," read, is a low.

" 89, last line, add these words—"in English Prayer-book."